DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 944 HE 011 763

AUTHOR Pigge, Fred L.
TITLE Opinions about Accreditation and Interagency Cooperation: The Results of a Nationwide Survey of COPA Institutions.
INSTITUTION Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 79
NOTE 90p.
AVAILABLE FROM Committee on Postsecondary Education, Suite 760, One Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC 20036

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Administrative Problems; Higher Education; Institutional Administration; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *National Surveys; Opinions; *Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Accrediting Agencies

ABSTRACT

The results of a nationwide survey of accredited institutions investigating opinions about accreditation and interagency cooperation and about accrediting activities in the institutions surveyed are reported. The survey sample consisted of 593 institutions and their 2144 academic units/programs. Of these, 426 institutions and 1175 of heads of programs responded to the survey. The primary purpose of the survey was to gather data that would indicate the extent to which institutions wished to pursue cooperative accrediting arrangements. An overwhelming majority of those who had not experienced cooperative accreditation desired to participate in future cooperative endeavors and an overwhelming majority of those who had experienced joint ventures desired to continue such activities. Respondents who had experienced cooperative accreditation indicated very positive evaluation of such activities. Opinions about accreditation in general indicated that most respondents believed that both institutional (or regional) and specialized accreditation are necessary and that each type produces positive results. In terms of benefits, accreditation efforts are not considered too costly. Opinions about the problems involved in accreditation by more than one agency and about cooperative accrediting arrangements were also discussed. Appendices include the survey instrument and cover letters and summaries of the comments and suggestions offered by the respondents. (SC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177944

AUG 31 1979

OPINIONS ABOUT ACCREDITATION AND INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

A NATIONWIDE SURVEY

Fred L. Pigge

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CoPA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY ACCREDITATION

HE 011 763

Opinions About Accreditation and Interagency Cooperation

The Results of a Nationwide Survey of COPA Institutions

A Report
Presented to
Kenneth E. Young, President
Committee on Postsecondary Accreditation

Prepared by

Fred L. Pigge
Director, Educational Research and Services
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
July, 1979

Additional copies available for $5.00 prepaid from:

Council on Postsecondary Accreditation
One Dupont Circle, Suite 760
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/452-1433

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Description	Page
COPA Survey Opinions About Accreditation and Interagency Cooperation	1
Purposes of the Survey	1
Procedures of the Study	1
The Population and Sample	3
Return Rate	5
Analysis of Respondents' Background Experiences	6
The Major and Pertinent Findings of the Study	10
An Evaluation of Past Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements	14
Summary of the Opinions About Accreditation in General	16
Summary of the Opinions About Accreditation By More Than One Agency	18
Summary of Opinions About Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements	20
Additional Analyses	24
Table 4 through Table 48 (blue sheets)	29
Appendix 1	
The Survey Instrument and the Cover Letters	55
Appendix 2	
The Reasons for Respondents Wishing to Continue or Discontinue Future Cooperative Arrangements	69
Appendix 3	
A Listing of Concerns or Problems Caused by Multiple Accrediting Agencies Serving the Same Institution or Program	73
Appendix 4	
Suggested Groupings of Agencies for Cooperative Accreditation Activities	79

Section Description Page

Appendix 5

Recommendations as to How Interagency Cooperative Arrangements Could Be Improved 87

Appendix 6

Additional Comments Related to Respondents' Experiences With Interagency Cooperative Arrangements in Accreditation 91

COPA Survey

Opinions About Accreditation and Interagency Cooperation

One of the major ongoing responsibilities of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) is to assist institutions and accrediting agencies to work together in the interest of academic quality, and one of COPA's continuing concerns is that accrediting activities be conducted as efficiently as possible. Some persons believe that increased cooperation and collaboration among accrediting agencies might help to contain costs, but COPA has not known to what extent institutions wished to pursue cooperative accrediting arrangements. This was the primary reason for COPA sponsoring this nationwide survey of accredited institutions and their programs.

Purpose of the Survey

The first two paragraphs on the COPA Survey Form that was sent to presidents and deans/heads/chairpersons of academic units summarized the purposes of the study. These two paragraphs are reproduced below:

We ask your assistance in completing the following survey for the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. Our purpose is to obtain opinions and information about accrediting activities in your institution, and about the prospects for interagency cooperation in accreditation.

Some accrediting agencies and institutions have shown interest in cooperative accrediting ventures; others have been reluctant for various reasons. Some believe that cooperative efforts result in significant cost savings for institutions; others feel that the difficulties of coordination are nearly insurmountable. This study will gather opinions from a diverse, nationwide sample of postsecondary institutions. By so doing it will help COPA, which has responsibility for the governance of accreditation in the U.S., to determine the extent to which it should encourage interagency efforts among the accrediting groups. Your response is therefore important and we appreciate your willingness to help.

Procedures of the Study

COPA and its Advisory Committee on Interagency Cooperation decided in 1978 to conduct a nationwide survey of accredited institutions —

the primary purpose was the gathering of opinions of institutional personnel about cooperation in accrediting.

The first draft (January, 1979) of the instrument was developed by Marie Carver of the University of Arizona under the direction of Professor Fred Harcleroad and in consultation with members of the COPA Advisory Committee on Interagency Cooperation.

The second and eventually the final drafts of the instrument were developed by Fred Pigge, Director of Educational Research and Services, Bowling Green State University; Robert Glidden, member of the COPA Board and Dean of the College of Musical Arts, Bowling Green State University; Kenneth E. Young, President of COPA; and Kay Andersen, outgoing Chairman of the COPA Advisory Committee on Interagency Cooperation and Executive Director of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. The second draft of the survey was agreed upon by the above named four persons on March 6, 1979.

A limited pilot of the survey was done at Bowling Green State University between March 15, 1979, and April 6, 1979. Also during this period of time, each member of the COPA Advisory Committee on Interagency Cooperation received a copy of the survey and was asked to forward suggestions for revisions.

Suggestions and data gathered from all these sources led to the final draft of the survey which was published on April 10, 1979.

Five hundred ninety-three institutions were selected for the survey sample. On April 2, 1979, COPA President Kenneth Young sent a letter to each of the 593 institutional presidents advising them of the forthcoming survey and asking their cooperation in the completion of such.

Letters were also sent from the executives of the various regional accrediting associations.

On April 16, 1979, the 593 packets of surveys were mailed to the institutions. Follow-up letters were mailed on May 2 and May 25, 1979. Copies of the three letters and the survey form are presented in Appendix 1 of the present report.

Approximately 10 weeks were allowed for the institutions to respond. Completed survey forms received after June 30, 1979, were not analyzed.

The completed survey forms were mailed by the various institutions to Educational Research and Services, Bowling Green State University, for keypunching, analysis, and reporting.

The Population and Sample

The list of accredited institutions as published in the 1978-79 Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education (published for COPA by the American Council on Education) was examined to determine the number of institutions that were accredited by two or more accrediting agencies. This analysis revealed that 1784 institutions and their programs were being accredited by multiple COPA agencies. The 1784 institutions possessed 7181 academic units or programs. Thus, the population for this study was the 1784 above described institutions and their 7181 academic units/programs.

It was decided to use 1/3 of the institutions for the purposes of the present study. This sample was obtained by randomly selecting a starting point from among the first three qualified institutions on the alphabetical by-and-within state listings of the 1784 institutions. The third institution was randomly selected and the sample consisted of it and every third institution thereafter.

This process resulted in the selection of 593 of the 1784 institutions. These 593 institutions and their 2144 academic units/programs comprised the sample for the study. This process resulted in a 33% sampling of the total number of qualified institutions and a 30% sampling of their academic units/programs.

The 593 institutions of higher education were distributed among the following institutional accrediting bodies:

Institutional Accrediting Body	Number of Schools in Sample
American Association of Bible Colleges	4
Association of Independent Colleges and Schools	2
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Higher Education	104
National Association of Trade and Technical Schools	23
National Home Study Council	0
New England Association of Schools and Colleges	41
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools	192
Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges	28
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools - Commission on Colleges	121
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools - Commission on Occupational Education Institutions	6
Western Association of Schools and Colleges - Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges	26
Western Association of Schools and Colleges - Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges	19
No Regional or Institutional Affiliation	27
Total	593

Five hundred ninety-three packets of survey forms were sent to the presidents of the selected institutions on April 16, 1979. Each packet contained copies of appropriate cover letters and sufficient numbers of survey forms for each of the following persons to complete:

1. President or his designee (usually chief academic officer or accreditation liaison officer)--on behalf of the institution.
2. Dean or chairperson of each of the accredited programs within each institution--on behalf of individual programs.

Return Rate

A total of 593 packets containing 2737 survey forms were sent to the sample of 593 institutions on April 16, 1979. An analysis of the returned packets indicated that one or more individuals in 426 of the 593 institutions had completed one or more copies of the survey. Thus, institutional rate of return was 72%. As of July 1, 1979 (the cut-off date for consideration of returned surveys), the following number of individually completed surveys had been received:

From	f		Percent	
President	135	486	8%	29%
Chief Academic Officers	284		17%	
Accreditation Liaison Officers	67		4%	
Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs	1175		70%	
People who neglected to specify current position	22		1%	
Total returns	1683		100%	

Data presented above show that 1175 of 2144 heads of programs responded. This produced a return rate of 55% for the academic units.

There were 60 institutions that did not follow the instructions literally, i.e., there were 60 packets which produced more than one

person responding as president or chief academic officer or accreditation liaison officer. It was anticipated that only one of these officers per institution would complete a survey form on behalf of the institution. The resultant action was in many cases caused by heads of academic programs also holding a second title, that of chief academic officer or accreditation liaison officer.

Nevertheless, the total number of 1683 completed forms represented a 61% return of the 2737 that were distributed.

It is assumed that the returns compose an unbiased subset of the original sample of 593 institutions and their 2737 accredited programs, and furthermore that the findings from the returned set of surveys are indicative of the results that would have been found had the entire population (1784 institutions and 7181 academic units/programs) been surveyed.

Analysis of Respondents' Background Experiences (Section I of Survey)

The respondents were asked to classify their institutions as non-degree granting, two-year college, etc. Table 1 presents a breakdown of the respondents' answers to the two items which requested information regarding the types of institutions involved in this survey.

Table 1
Institutional Classification of the Respondents

Type of Institutions	Responses From: Presidents, Chief Academic Officers, or Accreditation Liaison Officers f	%	Heads of Academic Units/Programs f	%	Total f	%
1. Non-degree granting	11	2	9	1	20	1
2. Two-year college	126	26	214	18	340	21
3. Four-year liberal arts	93	19	192	16	285	17
4. Single purpose/ professional school(s)	60	12	83	7	143	9
5. Comprehensive with graduate or professional schools	152	32	611	52	763	46
6. Other	39	8	60	5	99	6
Total	481	99	1169	99	1650	100
	(33 did not respond to this item)					
1. Public	289	60	866	74	1155	70
2. Private	182	38	299	25	481	29
3. Proprietary	12	2	9	1	21	1
Total	483	100	1174	100	1657	100
	(26 people did not respond to this item)					

Examples of findings presented in Table 1 are:

1. Eleven presidents or chief academic officers or accreditation liaison officers were from non-degree granting institutions.
2. Nine heads or representatives of academic units/programs were from non-degree granting institutions.
3. 32% of the presidents and 52% of the heads of academic programs were from comprehensive institutions with graduate or professional schools.
4. 60% of the presidents and 74% of the heads of academic programs were from public institutions.

5. 70% of the respondents were from the public sector and approximately 30% were from private schools.

The respondents were also asked to indicate their previous personal experiences with accreditation activities. Table 2 presents a tabulation of the respondents' answers to these items.

Table 2
Respondents' Previous Personal Experiences with Accreditation

Accreditation Experience	Presidents, Chief Academic Officers, or Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads of Academic Units/Programs	
	f	%	f	%
A. Member of On-site Visiting Team				
1. Specialized/professional/ programmatic	130	27	465	40
2. Regional/institutional	197	41	180	15
B. Member of an Accrediting Commission				
1. Specialized/professional/ programmatic	42	9	181	15
2. Regional/institutional	66	14	36	3
C. Involved with Conducting Self-study or Responding to Accreditation Report(s)				
1. Leadership role	346	71	851	72
2. Member of committee	164	34	351	30
3. Limited involvement	45	9	102	9
Maximum number of individuals	486	N/A	1175	N/A

Data presented in Table 2 reveal that the presidents and program chairpersons had similar experience patterns for self-studies, i.e., 71% of the presidents and 72% of the chairpersons had leadership roles, etc. Table 2 data also reveal that presidents have had more experience as members of regional/institutional on-site visiting teams than have the heads of academic programs (41% compared to 15%). The opposite is true

for membership on specialized on-site visiting teams -- 40% of the chairpersons had served in this capacity while just 27% of the presidents had served. This same general pattern held for membership on the two types of accrediting commissions.

Point values were arbitrarily assigned as follows to the listed accreditation experiences:

1. Four points each to the two types of on-site visiting teams
2. Five points each to the two types of accrediting commissions
3. Three points to leadership role of self-studies
4. Two points to member of self-study committees
5. One point to limited involvement with self-studies

This produced a range of total scores or points from 0 (where a respondent would not have had any accreditation experience) to 24 (where a respondent would have indicated previous involvement with each of the listed accreditation activities).

It was decided to classify respondents as having limited accreditation experience if their total scores ranged between 0 and 3; respondents with scores between 4 and 11 as having average accreditation experience; and respondents with scores of 12 and above as having above average accreditation experience.

Table 3 presents a quantitative summary of the respondents' total personal experiences with accreditation, as per the point breakdown described in the previous paragraphs.

Table 3
Quantitative Summary of the Respondents' Total
Personal Experiences with Accreditation

Point Values	Presidents, Chief Academic Officers, or Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads of Academic Units/Programs		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 to 3 points (Limited accreditation experience)	184	38	565	49	749	46
4 to 11 points (Average accreditation experience)	207	43	417	36	624	38
12 to 24 points (Above average accreditation experience)	93	19	180	15	273	17
Total	484	100	1162	100	1646	101

An example of findings presented in Table 3 is that 38% of the presidents, 49% of the heads of academic programs, and 46% of the total number of respondents had limited personal experiences with accreditation activities. Similar percentages for above average accreditation experiences were 19% for presidents, 15% for heads of programs, and 17% of the total group.

The Major and Pertinent Findings of the Study

As stated before, the primary purpose of the survey was to gather data which would indicate the extent that institutions wished to pursue cooperative accrediting arrangements.

There were five survey items which directly attempted to gather opinions of institutional personnel regarding their wishes for cooperative ventures. The purpose of this section of the report is to summarize the findings related to these five items. The five items will be presented in the same sequence as they were presented on the survey form. The

first four items were answered by those who had not experienced cooperative accreditation -- the fifth and last item should have been answered only by those respondents who had experienced cooperative accrediting in their institutions.

The first of the five pertinent questions is reproduced below:

Although your institution has not experienced cooperative arrangements in accreditation, would your institution or academic unit be willing to participate in such activities?

1 ☐ yes
2 ☐ no
3 ☐ do not know

The responses to this item are presented in Table 4. The responses were broken down by two groupings: (1) presidents, chief academic officials, and liaison officers versus heads or representatives of academic units/programs, and (2) respondents with limited past accreditation experiences versus those with average and above average experiences.

Data presented in Table 4 reveal that 75% of the presidents or others speaking for the institution and 57% of the respondents speaking for the academic units were willing to participate in future cooperative accrediting arrangements. Only 4% of the presidents and 6% of the heads of academic units were not willing to participate in cooperative accreditation. Twenty-two percent of the presidents and 38% of the respondents from the academic units did not know if they wished to participate in future cooperative endeavors.

Table 4 data also indicate that 57% of the respondents with limited accreditation experiences were willing to participate in cooperative accreditation. Sixty-four percent and 67% of the respondents with average and above average accreditation experiences, respectively, were

willing to participate in cooperative accreditation endeavors.

An average of only 5% of the respondents were not willing to participate in cooperative accreditation. A valid conclusion is that an overwhelming majority of the respondents were in favor of participation in cooperative accreditation activities.

The second of the five pertinent questions was:

In your situation would a cooperative accrediting arrangement be ....

a. more effective? 1 ☐ yes
2 ☐ no
3 ☐ do not know

Table 5 presents a tabulation of the responses to the above questions, following the same format as Table 4.

Data presented in Table 5 show that 38% of the respondents answered "yes," 17% answered "no," and 45% responded that they "did not know." It should be noted, however, that 45% of the 202 respondents with above average accreditation experiences answered "yes" to this question. Evidence presented in Table 5 indicates that the number of "yes" answers was more than twice the number of "no" answers though an even greater number "did not know."

The third of the five pertinent questions was stated as follows:

In your situation would a cooperative accrediting arrangement be ....

b. more efficient? 1 ☐ yes
2 ☐ no
3 ☐ do not know

Table 6 presents the findings of the respondents answering this question. Sixty-eight percent of the presidents, 50% of the academic chairpersons, 47% of those with limited accreditation experience, 61% of those with average accreditation experience, and 61% of those with above average accrediting experiences answered in the affirmative. Only an average of approximately 12-13% answered in the negative while approximately

1/3 of the respondents "did not know" if the cooperative procedures would be more efficient.

The fourth of the five pertinent questions is reproduced below:

Would your institution or academic program be willing to assume the lead in determining how accrediting agencies could cooperate in serving your institution?

1 ☐ yes
2 ☐ no
3 ☐ do not know

Table 7 presents the statistics related to the opinions of the respondents to this item.

In brief, 53% of the presidents and 36% of the academic heads answered in the affirmative — for an average "yes" answer of 40%. Thirty-two percent of those respondents with limited accreditation experience and 44% and 53%, respectively, of those with average and above average accreditation experience marked the "yes" response. Only an average of 13% marked a "no" response to this item. Approximately 47-48% "did not know" whether their institution would assume the lead in determining how accrediting agencies could cooperate in serving their institutions.

The fifth and last of the pertinent questions was answered by only those who had experienced one or more cooperative accrediting activities. The fifth question was stated as follows:

	1	2	3	4	5
Based upon your experiences with past cooperative ventures, would your institution/academic unit/program participate in future cooperative arrangements?	YES	yes	?	no	NO

Please explain the reasons for your answer:

Table 8 presents a numerical summary of 213 respondents' answers to this question. In addition, Appendix 2 of this report presents a narrative summary of the respondents' written comments. There were

approximately 240 respondents (approximately 110 presidents and 130 chairpersons) who had experienced cooperative accreditation at their institutions.

Data presented in Table 8 reveal that 86% of the presidents and 80% of the chairpersons would participate in future cooperative arrangements. Only 5% indicated that they would not wish to participate in future cooperative endeavors. It is interesting to note that the respondents with above average accreditation experience were less positive about future cooperative activities than those with less accreditation experience. However, the numbers of these people were rather low, i.e., 5 respondents with negative responses comprised 11% of the "above average" sample.

In summary, an overwhelming majority of those who had not experienced cooperative accreditation desired to participate in future cooperative endeavors and an overwhelming majority of those who had experienced joint ventures desired to continue such activities.

An Evaluation of Past Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements

There were five items imbedded in Section IV of the survey which permitted the respondents who had experienced cooperative accreditation to evaluate, either directly or indirectly, the results of the cooperative ventures.

Tables 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 present the wording of the five items and summaries of the presidents' and chairpersons' responses to the five statements.

A sample of the findings presented in these five tables follows:

1. 85% of the 245 respondents believed the coordinated self-study process was beneficial to their institutions. Only 6% thought the process was not beneficial (Table 9).
2. 51% of the respondents stated that the costs of the cooperative arrangements were less of a burden on the institutions/academic units/programs than if separate studies/visits had been made. 20% of the respondents indicated that cost savings were not evident (Table 10).
3. 75% of the respondents stated that duplication of efforts was reduced by the cooperative arrangements — 14% did not believe there was a reduction in the duplication of efforts (Table 11).
4. 63% of the respondents indicated that the accreditation process was more helpful to the institution as a result of joint visits or other cooperative arrangements. 12% of the respondents indicated that joint visits were not more helpful (Table 12).
5. 47% of the respondents indicated that the resultant accreditation reports from the cooperative venture were more beneficial to the institution than if separate visits/studies had been made. 20% indicated that the joint reports were not more beneficial than the ones from separate visits or studies (Table 13).

In conclusion, the data presented in these five tables indicate a very positive evaluation of past cooperative accreditation activities. A majority, and in some instances an overwhelming majority, of the

respondents indicated that the coordinated self-study was beneficial, fees and costs were reduced, duplication of efforts was reduced, and that the whole accreditation process was more helpful. In addition, 47% of the respondents believed that the accreditation reports resulting from the cooperative ventures were more beneficial -- 20% did not evaluate the joint reports as more beneficial.

Summary of the Opinions About Accreditation in General

Part II of the survey presented 10 items which permitted the respondents to indicate their opinions about accreditation in general.

Tables 14 through 23 present the wording of these 10 items and tabulations of the answers given to each item by the presidents and heads of programs.

For purposes of brevity, only a limited sampling of the findings are presented in narrative form. The interested reader may examine the 10 tables and add to the following list of findings:

1. 93% of the respondents indicated that in most instances accreditation improves the overall quality of the institution and its programs. Only 4% held negative opinions toward the results of accreditation activities (Table 14).
2. 73% of the respondents did not believe that accreditation was too costly in what it accomplishes -- 17% thought that it was too costly (Table 15).
3. Presidents and others speaking for the institution did not value specialized accreditation to the extent of heads or representatives of academic programs. 60% of the presidents indicated that specialized accreditation was not more important

than institutional/regional, whereas 58% of the program heads indicated that it was (Table 16).

4. 51% of the presidents indicated that institutional (or regional) accreditation was more important than specialized accreditation; 71% of the program representatives disagreed (Table 17).
5. 82% of the respondents stated a need for both institutional and specialized accreditation (Table 18).
6. Only 1% of the respondents indicated no need for either institutional nor specialized accreditation (Table 19).
7. 40% of the presidents and 20% of the program representatives indicated that specialized accrediting agencies were too demanding. 73% of the program heads did not believe that the specialized agencies were too demanding (Table 20).
8. Only 5% of the presidents and 11% of the program heads indicated that they thought specialized agencies were not rigorous enough in their evaluations (Table 21).
9. Only 7% of the presidents and 3% of the program representatives indicated that they thought regional/institutional accrediting agencies were too demanding (Table 22).
10. 22% of the presidents and 19% of the program representatives indicated that regional/institutional accrediting agencies were not rigorous enough in their evaluations (Table 23).

In summary, it would appear that the respondents believe both types of accreditation to be necessary and that each type produces positive results. In terms of benefits, accreditation efforts are not considered too costly.

Summary of the Opinions About Accreditation By More Than One Agency

Part III of the survey presented 13 items which asked the respondents to indicate their opinions about possible problems associated with accreditation by more than one agency.

The introduction to Part III of the survey instrument is reproduced below:

Part III
Your Opinions About Accreditation
By More Than One Agency

Our sampling procedures assured us that this survey would be sent only to institutions being served by at least one regional/institutional and at least one specialized/programmatic accrediting agency. Parts III and IV of this questionnaire assume that your institution is thus involved with more than one agency. If for some reason this is not accurate, please fold the questionnaire and return it. Thank You.

If your institution participates in the activities of more than one accrediting agency, please give your opinions about the following statements by placing a circle around your response. The response code is:

A Strongly Agree

a Agree

? No opinion, undecided, do not know, do not understand statement

d Disagree

D Strongly Disagree

Tables 24 through 36 present the wording of the 13 items of this section and tabulations of the presidents' and program representatives' opinions toward each item.

For the sake of brevity, as before, only a few selected findings are placed in narrative form. The concerned reader is advised to examine data presented in Tables 24 through 36 for a more comprehensive list of pertinent findings.

The selected findings for this section of the survey are:

1. 77% of the presidents and 53% of the program representatives indicated that there was duplication of efforts by the accrediting agencies (Table 24).
2. 71% of the presidents and 48% of the program representatives stated that there was lack of coordination among the accrediting agencies in standards (Table 25).
3. 59% of the presidents and 40% of the programs indicated a lack of coordination among the accrediting agencies in the use of terminology (Table 26).
4. 68% of the presidents and 49% of the programs indicated a lack of coordination among the accrediting agencies in self-studies (Table 27).
5. 73% of the presidents and 53% of the programs indicated a lack of coordination among the agencies in the data requested (Table 28).
6. 59% of the presidents and 48% of the programs indicated a lack of coordination among the agencies in site visit activities (Table 29).
7. 66% of the presidents and 46% of the programs indicated a lack of coordination among the agencies in final report statement of facts and recommendations (Table 30).
8. 54% of the presidents and 39% of the programs indicated a lack of coordination among the agencies in accreditation decisions (Table 31).

9. 66% of the presidents and 51% of the programs indicated that accreditation by multiple agencies caused burdens in terms of fees (Table 32).
10. 80% of the presidents and 69% of the programs indicated that there were burdens in terms of preparation of reports (Table 33).
11. 65% of the presidents and 50% of the programs indicated that there were burdens in terms of site visit expenses (Table 34).
12. 66% of the presidents and 56% of the programs indicated that there were burdens in terms of time allocations for self-study reports and site visits (Table 35).
13. 53% of the presidents and 31% of the programs indicated that contradictory demands were made by the separate accrediting agencies (Table 36).

In summary, both the presidents and program representatives (the presidents to a greater extent than the program personnel) validated the 13 suggested problem areas associated with multiple accreditation.

The last question of Part III was open-ended and was stated as follows:

In the space below, please list or describe any other concerns or problems caused by multiple accrediting agencies serving your institution.

Appendix 3 presents a summary of the respondents' written comments to this question.

Summary of Opinions About Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements

There were 25 separate items presented in the last section of the survey. Five of the items were discussed in a previous section of this

report, "The Major and Pertinent Findings of the Study." Another set of five items were discussed in a previous section of the report entitled, "An Evaluation of Past Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements."

The findings of the first item are presented in Appendix 4. The first item and the introduction thereto are reproduced below:

Part IV

Your Opinion About Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements

There is a growing number of instances where two or more accrediting agencies work cooperatively with institutions. These cooperative ventures might be characterized by the following non-exhaustive listing of types of cooperative arrangements.

Two or more accrediting agencies:

- visited the institution at the same time and used a common institutional self-study
- made separate visits but used the same self-study.
- visited at the same time, used same core data but required additional and separate program self-studies.
- visited at separate times, used same core data.

With the above as a frame of reference, please continue:

1. Which accrediting agencies currently serving your institution, academic unit, or program area are or could be grouped together for cooperative arrangements?

Please use the two-digit codes of the agencies (both A and B) listed on page 2 of this questionnaire

The following agencies could be grouped together for cooperative accreditation activities:

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Appendix 4 presents several suggested groupings of agencies.

The 14 items that have not been discussed are either addressed immediately in this section of the report or in Appendices 5 and 6.

Tables 37 through 48 present the wording of the items and summaries of the presidents' and program representatives' opinions toward 12

factors associated with cooperative accreditation. There were 112 presidents and 133 program representatives who had experienced cooperative accreditation and who responded to one or more of these items.

As before, a few selected findings will be placed in narrative form. The reader may examine Tables 37-48 for additional findings. Selected findings from the 12 items are:

1. Approximately 3/4 of the respondents indicated that the purposes of the cooperative arrangements were clear to each accrediting agency involved in the cooperative venture (Table 37).
2. Approximately 85% of the respondents indicated that the cooperative arrangements were clear to the institution/academic unit/program (Table 38).
3. Approximately 70% of the respondents stated that the agency assuming the coordinating responsibility was clearly identified (Table 39).
4. 43% of the respondents indicated that written agreements were negotiated among all parties involved prior to the visit; 27% indicated that written agreements were lacking (Table 40).
5. 73% of the respondents indicated that the nature and composition of the self-study were clearly understood by all parties involved (Table 41).
6. 81% of the respondents indicated that the composition of the visiting team represented all agencies involved (Table 42).
7. 80% of the respondents indicated that the size of the visiting team was appropriate for proper evaluation (Table 43).

8. 68% of the respondents indicated that the team leaders were knowledgeable and interested in cooperative arrangements (Table 44).

9. 67% of the respondents indicated that the written report reflected the purposes, standards, and scope of activities of all the agencies involved (Table 45).

10. Only 33% of the respondents believed that the use of a generalist in specialized/programmatic accrediting activities resulted in a more balanced accrediting process. 13% indicated that the use of a generalist did not result in more balance and 54% did not respond either affirmatively or negatively (Table 46). Perhaps generalists have not been used to a great extent in the past cooperative visits.

11. 74% of the top formal and informal leaders at the institutions/academic units/programs supported and actively participated in the cooperative arrangements to either a great or moderate extent (Table 47).

12. 45% of the respondents indicated that the institution assumed the lead in requesting the cooperative activity, 37% indicated that the accrediting agencies made the suggestions which resulted in cooperation (Table 48).

The two items, both open-ended, that have not been discussed in this report are reproduced below:

Based on your experience, do you have any recommendations as to how interagency cooperative arrangements could be improved in future situations?

If you have any additional comments related to your experience with interagency cooperative arrangements in accreditation, please record them below:

A summary of the respondents' recommendations relative to the first item presented above is presented in Appendix 5. A summary of their comments related to the second item is presented in Appendix 6.

In summary, this section presented the respondents' opinions toward several factors associated with cooperative accreditation. These same respondents gave positive ratings to the results of the cooperative accreditation activities and the great majority indicated a desire to continue cooperative accreditation ventures. It would seem that most if not all the factors discussed in this section are related to successful cooperative endeavors, i.e., clear understandings, coordinating responsibility clearly delineated, written agreements, nature of self-study understood by all, visiting team of appropriate size and representative of all agencies, team leaders who believe in the value of cooperative endeavors, and written reports which reflect the purposes, standards, and scope of activities of all the involved agencies.

Additional Analyses

Ten different analyses were completed on the responses to this survey. This report was primarily based upon a comparison of the responses of the presidents, chief academic officials or accreditation liaison officers and the heads or representatives of academic units/programs.

A few tables in this report showed selected results of another analysis. This analysis divided the respondents into three groups and then determined how each group responded to each item of the survey. The three groups were: (1) respondents with limited past accreditation experience, (2) respondents with an average amount of accreditation

experience, and (3) respondents with an above average amount of past accreditation experiences.

The other 8 analyses were:

1. The heads or representatives of academic units or programs were divided into three groups on the basis of the specialized/ programmatic/ professional accrediting agency or agencies serving their programs.

   The three groups were described as follows:

   a. Graduation from approved program required for licensure/ certification to practice.

   b. Programs primarily promoted by a professional society without strong link between certification and accreditation and usually offering individual memberships in or registration by the society.

   c. Programs accredited as units with the units holding membership in associations of "schools" that, in turn, conduct or directly support accrediting activities.

An analysis was then completed which showed how the individuals in each group responded to each item of the survey. Responses of the program heads, categorized as above, to the five most pertinent items in the survey are presented in Tables 49-53. Generally, representatives of those disciplines accredited by associations of schools are more positive about cooperative accrediting arrangements than those accredited by individual-membership professional societies or agencies whose accreditation is required for licensure or certification.

2. An analysis was completed showing how respondents from the following institutions responded to each survey item:
   a. non-degree granting
   b. two-year college
   c. four-year liberal arts college
   d. single purpose/professional school
   e. comprehensive with graduate or professional school(s)
   f. other
3. The respondents were divided into three groups on the basis of whether their institutions were public, private, or proprietary. An analysis was then completed indicating how each of these three groups responded to each item of the survey.
4. The respondents who answered two specific items in Part II of the survey in a specific pattern were classified as "pro accreditation." The responses these individuals gave to each survey item were then compared to the responses given by those respondents who were not classified as "pro accreditation."
5. The respondents who answered three specific items in Part II of the survey in a specific pattern were classified as "pro institutional." The responses these "pro institutional" respondents gave to each item of the survey were then compared to the responses given by those respondents who were not classified as "pro institutional."
6. The respondents who answered three specific items in Part II of the survey in a specific pattern were classified as "pro specialized." Their responses to each item were then compared

with the responses of the respondents who were not classified as "pro specialized."

7. The respondents who answered two specific items in Part II of the survey with a certain pattern were classified as "anti accreditation." Their responses to each item were then compared with the responses of the respondents who were not classified as "anti accreditation."
8. The respondents from the various institutions were classified into three groups, based on the number of COPA agencies serving their institutions. Institutions were then classified as small, average, or large. An analysis was then completed showing how the three groups of respondents answered each item of the survey.

A computer printout of each of these 10 analyses is housed in COPA headquarters, Suite 760, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. An interested reader of this report may ascertain the findings of any specific analysis for any specific items by contacting COPA headquarters.

Table 4

Responses to: Would your institution or academic unit be willing to participate in cooperative accrediting arrangements?

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs		Total		Past Experiences With Accreditation							
							Limited		Average		Above Average		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	247	75%	517	57%	764	61%	328	57%	300	64%	136	67%	764	61%
No	12	4%	53	6%	65	5%	26	5%	20	4%	17	8%	63	5%
Do not Know	72	22%	343	38%	415	33%	220	38%	150	32%	50	25%	420	34%
Totals	331	100%	913	100%	1244	100%	574	100%	470	100%	203	100%	1247	100%
	(439 did not respond)						(436 No Response)							

Table 5

Responses to: In your situation would a cooperative accreditation arrangement be more effective?

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs		Total		Past Experiences With Accreditation							
							Limited		Average		Above Average		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	164	49%	314	34%	478	38%	199	34%	193	40%	91	45%	483	38%
No	28	8%	186	20%	214	17%	105	18%	71	15%	35	17%	211	17%
Do not know	145	43%	424	46%	569	45%	279	48%	215	45%	76	38%	570	45%
Totals	337	100%	924	100%	1261	100%	583	100%	479	100%	202	100%	1264	100%
	(422 No Response)						(419 No Response)							

Table 6
Responses to: In your situation would a cooperative accrediting arrangement be more efficient?

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs		Total		Past Experiences With Accreditation							
							Limited		Average		Above Average		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	225	68%	454	50%	679	55%	270	47%	288	61%	122	61%	680	55%
No	18	5%	138	15%	156	13%	83	15%	45	10%	27	13%	155	12%
Do not know	88	27%	321	35%	409	33%	219	38%	141	30%	52	26%	412	33%
Totals	331	100%	913	100%	1244	100%	572	100%	474	100%	201	100%	1247	100%
	(439 No response)						(436 No response)							

Table 7
Responses to: Would your institution or academic program be willing to assume the lead in determining how accrediting agencies could cooperate in serving your institution?

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs		Total		Past Experiences With Accreditation							
							Limited		Average		Above Average		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	176	53%	328	36%	504	40%	184	32%	210	44%	108	53%	502	40%
No	34	10%	128	14%	162	13%	92	16%	50	10%	18	9%	160	13%
Do not know	123	37%	468	51%	591	47%	301	52%	220	46%	77	38%	598	48%
Totals	333	100%	924	100%	1257	100%	577	100%	480	100%	203	100%	1260	100%
	(426 No response)						(423 No response)							

Table 8

Responses to: Based upon your experiences with past cooperative ventures, would your institution/academic unit/program participate in future cooperative arrangements?*

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	49	50	86%	66	58	80%	115	54	83%
Yes	36	36		25	22		61	29	
?	8	8		17	15		25	12	
no	4	4	6%	5	4	5%	9	4	5%
NO	2	2		1	1		3	1	
Totals	99	100%		114	100%		213	100%	

Past Experiences With Accreditation

Responses	Limited			Average			Above Average			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	47	58	84%	48	54	86%	19	43	73%	114	53	82%
Yes	21	26		28	32		13	30		62	29	
?	9	11		10	11		7	16		26	12	
no	3	4	5%	2	2	3%	4	9	11%	9	4	5%
NO	1	1		1	1		1	2		3	1	
Totals	81	100%		89	100%		44	100%		214	99%	

* For a summary of the reasons for their responses, please see Appendix 2 of the present report.

Table 9

Responses to: The coordinated self-study process was beneficial to our institution/academic unit/program

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	30	27	88%	57	43	82%	87	36	85%
yes	68	61		52	39		120	49	
?	6	5		10	8		16	7	
no	4	4	5%	6	5	8%	10	4	6%
NO	1	1		4	3		5	2	
N/A	3	3		4	3		7	3	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 10
Responses to: The fees and costs of the cooperative arrangements compated to separate studies/visits were less of a burden on the institution/academic unit/program.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	23	21	62%	21	16	41%	44	18	51%
yes	46	41		34	25		80	33	
?	23	21		43	32		66	27	
no	11	10	15%	23	17	23%	34	14	20%
NO	6	5		8	6		14	6	
N/A	3	3		5	4		8	3	
Totals	112	100%		134	100%		246	100%	

Table 11
Responses to: Duplication of efforts was reduced by the cooperative arrangements.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	33	30	81%	51	38	71%	84	34	75%
yes	57	51		44	33		101	41	
?	8	7		12	9		20	8	
no	9	8	11%	21	16	18%	30	12	14%
NO	3	3		3	2		6	2	
N/A	2	2		2	2		4	2	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 12
Responses to: The accreditation process was more helpful to the institution as a result of joint visits or other cooperative arrangements.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	19	17	64%	29	22	61%	48	20	63%
yes	53	47		52	39		105	43	
?	21	19		34	26		55	22	
no	14	13	15%	10	8	10%	24	10	12%
NO	2	2		3	2		5	2	
N/A	3	3		5	4		8	3	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 13
Responses to: The resultant accreditation report(s) from the cooperative venture was (were) more benefical to the institution than if separate visits/studies had been made.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	14	13	51%	22	17	43%	36	15	47%
yes	43	38		35	26		78	32	
?	27	24		46	35		73	30	
no	19	17	21%	19	14	18%	38	16	20%
NO	4	4		5	4		9	4	
N/A	5	5		6	5		11	5	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 14
Responses to: In most instances accreditation improves the overall quality of the institution and its programs.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	169	35	93%	534	46	94%	703	42	93%
Agree	284	58		564	48		848	51	
?	13	3		30	3		43	3	
Disagree	17	4	5%	39	3	3%	56	3	4%
Strongly Disagree	3	1		5	0		8	1	
Totals	486	100%		1172	100%		1658	100%	

Table 15
Responses to: Accreditation is too costly for what it accomplishes.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	19	4	22%	42	4	16%	61	4	17%
Agree	86	18		134	12		220	13	
?	46	10		122	11		168	10	
Disagree	262	54	69%	594	51	75%	856	52	73%
Strongly Disagree	70	15		275	24		345	21	
Totals	483	100%		1167	100%		1650	100%	

Table 16
Responses to: Specialized (or programmatic) accreditation is more important and helpful than institutional (or regional) accreditation.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	43	9	27%	258	22	58%	301	18	48%
Agree	85	18		412	36		497	30	
?	66	14		172	15		238	15	
Disagree	203	42	60%	281	24	27%	484	30	37%
Strongly Disagree	85	18		35	3		120	7	
Totals	482	100%		1158	100%		1640	100%	

Table 17
Responses to: Institutional (or regional) accreditation is more important and helpful than specialized (or programmatic) accreditation.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	84	17	51%	20	2	12%	104	6	23%
Agree	162	34		120	10		282	17	
?	63	13		193	17		256	16	
Disagree	150	31	36%	653	56	71%	803	49	61%
Strongly Disagree	24	5		174	15		198	12	
Total	483	100%		1160	100%		1643	100%	

Table 18
Responses to: Both institutional (or regional) and specialized (or programmatic) accreditation are important and necessary.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	91	19	75%	370	32	86%	461	28	82%
Agree	269	56		631	54		900	54	
?	61	13		94	8		155	9	
Disagree	50	10	13%	64	6	7%	114	7	9%
Strongly Disagree	14	3		11	1		25	2	
Totals	485	100%		1170	100%		1655	100%	

Table 19
Responses to: Neither institutional (regional) nor specialized (programmatic) accreditation is important or necessary.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	1	0	1%	3	0	1%	4	0	1%
Agree	6	1		15	1		21	1	
?	22	5		32	3		54	3	
Disagree	195	41	94%	417	36	96%	612	37	95%
Strongly Disagree	257	53		699	60		956	58	
Totals	481	100%		1166	100%		1647	100%	

Table 20
Responses to: Specialized/programmatic accrediting agencies are to demanding.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	50	10	40%	57	5	20%	107	7	26%
Agree	143	30		177	15		320	19	
?	75	16		78	7		153	9	
Disagree	183	38	44%	647	55	73%	830	50	65%
Strongly Disagree	29	6		213	18		242	15	
Totals	480	100%		1172	100%		1652	100%	

Table 21
Responses to: Specialized/programmatic accrediting agencies are not rigorous enough in their evaluations.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	1	0	5%	17	2	11%	18	1	9%
Agree	24	5		105	9		129	8	
?	74	16		91	8		165	10	
Disagree	296	62	79%	698	60	82%	994	60	81%
Strongly Disagree	83	17		258	22		341	21	
Totals	478	100%		1169	100%		1647	100%	

Table 22
Responses to: Regional/institutional accrediting agencies are to demanding.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	5	1	7%	3	0	3%	8	1	5%
Agree	31	6		37	3		68	4	
?	49	10		343	29		392	24	
Disagree	321	66	83%	647	55	67%	968	59	72%
Strongly Disagree	80	17		139	12		219	13	
Totals	486	100%		1169	100%		1655	100%	

Table 23
Responses to: Regional/institutional accrediting agencies are not rigorous enough in their evaluations.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	18	4	22%	38	3	19%	56	3	20%
Agree	86	18		189	16		275	17	
?	75	16		383	33		458	28	
Disagree	262	54	63%	487	42	48%	749	45	52%
Strongly Disagree	43	9		69	6		112	7	
Totals	484	100%		1166	100%		1650	100%	

Table 24
Responses to: There is duplication of efforts by the accrediting agencies.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	104	23	77%	134	13	53%	238	16	60%
Agree	241	54		424	40		665	44	
?	31	7		134	13		165	11	
Disagree	64	14	16%	301	28	35%	365	24	29%
Strongly Disagree	8	2		72	7		80	5	
Totals	448	100%		1065	100%		1513	100%	

Table 25
Responses to: There is lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in standards.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	76	17	71%	121	11	48%	197	13	55%
Agree	235	54		396	37		631	42	
?	65	15		249	23		314	21	
Disagree	54	12	14%	260	25	28%	314	21	24%
Strongly Disagree	8	2		36	3		44	3	
Totals	438	100%		1062	100%		1500	100%	

Table 26
Responses to: There is lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in the terminology used.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	52	12	59%	85	8	40%	137	9	45%
Agree	201	47		338	32		539	36	
?	103	24		319	30		422	28	
Disagree	67	16	18%	280	27	30%	347	23	26%
Strongly Disagree	9	2		34	3		43	3	
Totals	432	100%		1056	100%		1488	100%	

Table 27
Responses to: There is lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in self-study.

Responses	Presidents. Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	77	18	68%	126	12	49%	203	14	55%
Agree	219	50		388	37		607	41	
?	67	15		249	24		316	21	
Disagree	68	16	18%	260	25	28%	328	22	28%
Strongly Disagree	8	2		34	3		42	3	
Totals	439	100%		1057	100%		1496	100%	

Table 28
Responses to: There is lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in data requested.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	79	18	73%	126	12	53%	205	14	59%
Agree	242	55		435	41		677	45	
?	55	12		229	22		284	19	
Disagree	58	13	15%	237	22	25%	295	20	23%
Strongly Disagree	9	2		30	3		39	3	
Totals	443	100%		1057	100%		1500	100%	

Table 29
Responses to: There is lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in site visit activities.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	59	13	59%	111	11	48%	170	11	51%
Agree	201	46		392	37		593	40	
?	69	16		247	23		316	21	
Disagree	100	23	26%	279	26	29%	379	25	28%
Strongly Disagree	11	3		31	3		42	3	
Totals	440	100%		1060	100%		1500	100%	

Table 30
Responses to: There is lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in final report statement of facts and recommendations.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	68	16	66%	107	10	46%	175	12	52%
Agree	218	50		381	36		599	40	
?	76	17		284	27		360	24	
Disagree	68	16	18%	252	24	27%	320	21	24%
Strongly Disagree	10	2		34	3		44	3	
Totals	440	100%		1058	100%		1498	100%	

Table 31
Responses to: There is lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in accreditation decisions.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	54	12	54%	90	9	39%	144	10	43%
Agree	182	42		317	30		499	33	
?	102	23		346	33		448	30	
Disagree	87	20	23%	264	25	29%	351	24	27%
Strongly Disagree	13	3		38	4		51	3	
Totals	438	100%		1055	100%		1493	100%	

Table 32
Responses to: There are burdens in terms of fees.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	103	23	66%	192	18	51%	295	20	56%
Agree	190	43		357	33		547	36	
?	56	13		219	21		275	18	
Disagree	90	20	21%	250	23	28%	340	23	27%
Strongly Disagree	5	1		50	5		55	4	
Totals	444	100%		1068	100%		1512	100%	

Table 33
Responses to: There are burdens in terms of preparation of reports.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	135	30	80%	264	25	69%	399	26	72%
Agree	224	50		467	44		691	46	
?	18	4		103	10		121	8	
Disagree	65	15	16%	199	19	23%	264	17	20%
Strongly Disagree	4	1		37	4		41	3	
Totals	446	100%		1070	100%		1516	100%	

Table 34
Responses to: There are burdens in terms of site visit expenses.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	98	22	65%	170	16	50%	268	18	55%
Agree	191	43		362	34		553	37	
?	55	12		210	20		265	18	
Disagree	96	22	23%	275	26	31%	371	25	29%
Strongly Disagree	4	1		49	5		53	4	
Totals	444	100%		1066	100%		1510	100%	

Table 35
Responses to: There are burdens in terms of time allocation for self-study report and site visit.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	102	23	66%	203	19	56%	305	20	58%
Agree	188	43		385	37		573	38	
?	41	9		147	14		188	13	
Disagree	104	24	25%	276	26	30%	380	25	28%
Strongly Disagree	6	1		43	4		49	3	
Totals	441	100%		1054	100%		1495	100%	

Table 36
Responses to: There are burdens in terms of contradictory demands made by separate accrediting agencies.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
Strongly Agree	68	15	53%	90	9	31%	158	11	38%
Agree	167	38		232	22		399	27	
?	89	20		319	30		408	27	
Disagree	111	25	26%	352	33	39%	463	31	36%
Strongly Disagree	6	1		68	6		74	5	
Totals	441	100%		1061	100%		1502	100%	

Table 37
Responses to: The purposes of the cooperative arrangements were clear to each accrediting agency involved.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	30	27	74%	55	41	76%	85	35	75%
yes	53	47		46	35		99	40	
?	18	16		20	15		38	16	
no	6	5	10%	8	6	8%	14	6	9%
NO	5	5		3	2		8	3	
N/A	0	0		1	1		1	0	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 38
Responses to: The purposes of the cooperative arrangements were clear to the institution/academic unit/program.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	32	29	87%	61	46	84%	93	38	85%
yes	65	58		51	38		116	47	
?	3	3		10	8		13	5	
no	10	9	11%	8	6	8%	18	7	9%
NO	2	2		2	2		4	2	
N/A	0	0		1	1		1	0	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 39
Responses to: The agency assuming the coordinating responsibility was clearly identified.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	31	28	69%	48	36	73%	79	32	71%
yes	46	41		49	37		95	39	
?	14	13		17	13		31	13	
no	14	13	18%	14	11	14%	28	12	16%
NO	5	5		4	3		9	4	
N/A	1	1		1	1		2	1	
Totals	111	100%		133	100%		244	100%	

Table 40
Responses to: Written agreements concerning the cooperative arrangements were negotiated among all parties involved prior to the visit.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	19	17	41%	33	25	46%	52	21	43%
yes	27	24		28	21		55	22	
?	29	26		40	30		69	28	
no	28	25	32%	18	14	23%	46	19	27%
NO	8	7		12	9		20	8	
N/A	1	1		2	2		3	1	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 41
Responses to: The nature and composition of the self-study were clearly understood by all parties involved.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	22	20	67%	34	26	79%	56	23	73%
yes	52	47		70	53		122	50	
?	15	14		17	13		32	13	
no	14	13	17%	8	6	8%	22	9	12%
NO	4	4		2	2		6	3	
N/A	4	4		2	2		6	3	
Totals	111	100%		133	100%		244	100%	

Table 42
Responses to: The composition of the visiting team represented all agencies involved.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	38	34	87%	52	39	75%	90	37	81%
yes	59	53		48	36		107	44	
?	9	8		14	11		23	9	
no	1	1	4%	9	7	11%	10	4	7%
NO	3	3		5	4		8	3	
N/A	2	2		5	4		7	3	
Totals	112	100%		133	100%		245	100%	

Table 43
Responses to: The size of the visiting team was appropriate for proper evaluation.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	26	23	79%	51	38	81%	77	31	80%
yes	62	56		57	43		119	49	
?	6	5		10	8		16	7	
no	11	10	15%	7	5	8%	18	7	11%
NO	5	5		4	3		9	4	
N/A	1	1		5	4		6	2	
Totals	111	100%		134	100%		245	100%	

Table 44
Responses to: The team leader(s) were knowledgeable and interested in cooperative arrangements.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	25	22	68%	43	32	66%	68	28	68%
yes	52	46		46	34		98	40	
?	23	21		30	22		53	22	
no	9	8	9%	10	8	9%	19	8	9%
NO	1	1		1	1		2	1	
N/A	2	2		4	3		6	2	
Totals	112	100%		134	100%		246	100%	

Table 45
Responses to: The written report reflected the purposes, standards, and scope of activities of all the agencies involved.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	20	18	67%	29	22	67%	49	20	67%
yes	54	49		59	45		113	47	
?	13	12		24	18		37	15	
no	15	14	17%	9	7	12%	24	10	14%
NO	3	3		7	5		10	4	
N/A	6	5		4	3		10	4	
Totals	111	100%		132	100%		243	100%	

Table 46

Responses to: The use of a generalized/programmatic accrediting resulted in a more balanced accrediting process.

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officicals, Accreditation Liaison Officers			Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs			Total		
	N	Percent		N	Percent		N	Percent	
YES	10	9	35%	12	9	32%	22	9	33%
yes	29	26		30	23		59	24	
?	40	36		48	36		88	36	
no	10	9	13%	14	11	13%	24	10	13%
NO	4	4		3	2		7	3	
N/A	19	17		25	19		44	18	
Totals	112	100%		132	100%		244	100%	

Table 47

Responses to: To what extent did top formal and informal leaders at your institution/academic unit/program support and actively participate in the cooperative arrangements?

Responses	Presidents Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Great Extent	50	46	62	48	112	47
Moderate Extent	33	30	30	23	63	27
Slight Extent	14	13	18	14	32	14
Not at all	7	6	4	3	11	5
Do not know	5	5	14	11	19	8
Totals	109	100%	128	100%	237	100%

Table 48

Responses to: What led to the cooperative accreditation arrangements that you experienced?

1 ☐ Institution assumed the lead in requesting the cooperative activity.

2 ☐ The accrediting agencies made the suggestions which resulted in cooperation.

3 ☐ Other (please explain)_____

Responses	Presidents, Chief Academic Officials, Accreditation Liaison Officers		Heads or Representatives of Academic Units/Programs		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Institution	45	44	57	45	102	45
Agencies	46	45	39	31	85	37
Other	11	11	31	24	42	18
Totals	102	100%	127	100%	229	100%

Table 49
Responses to: IV-2, Have any cooperative arrangements been experienced? (by categories of agencies)

Responses	Required for Licensure/ Certification		Professional Societies w/o Licensure Requirement		Association of Schools		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	48	11	61	16	41	14	150	14
No	244	56	176	46	158	55	578	52
Do Not Know	141	33	147	38	88	31	376	34
Total	433	100%	384	100%	287	100%	1104	100%

Table 50
Responses to: Would your institution or academic unit be willing to participate in cooperative accrediting arrangements? (by categories of agencies)

Responses	Required for Licensure/ Certification		Professional Societies w/o Licensure Requirement		Association of Schools		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	203	53	196	59	166	66	565	59
No	22	6	19	6	11	4	52	5
Do Not Know	157	41	118	35	75	30	350	36
Total	382	100%	333	100%	252	100%	967	100%

Table 51
Responses to: In your situation would a cooperative accreditation arrangement be more effective? (by categories of agencies)

Responses	Required for Licensure/ Certification		Professional Societies w/o Licensure Requirement		Association of Schools		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	133	34	95	28	113	45	341	35
No	77	20	75	22	34	14	186	19
Do Not Know	178	46	169	50	104	41	451	46
Total	388	100%	339	100%	251	100%	978	100%

Table 52
Responses to: In your situation would a cooperative accreditation arrangement be more efficient?
(by categories of agencies)

Responses	Required for Licensure/ Certification		Professional Societies w/o Licensure Requirement		Association of Schools		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	186	49	163	48	156	62	505	52
No	59	15	53	16	25	10	137	14
Do Not Know	136	36	122	36	70	28	328	34
Total	381	100%	338	100%	251	100%	970	100%

Table 53
Responses to: Would your institution or academic program be willing to assume the lead in determining how accrediting agencies could cooperate in serving your institution?
(by categories of agencies)

Responses	Required for Licensure/ Certification		Professional Societies w/o Licensure Requirement		Association of Schools		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	142	37	113	33	106	42	361	37
No	48	12	59	17	27	11	134	14
Do Not Know	196	51	167	49	120	47	483	49
Total	386	100%	339	100%	253	100%	978	100%

Appendix 1

The Survey Instrument and the Cover Letters

COPA Survey

Opinions About Accreditation and Interagency Cooperation

We ask your assistance in completing the following survey for the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. Our purpose is to obtain opinions and information about accrediting activities in your institution, and about the prospects for interagency cooperation in accreditation.

Some accrediting agencies and institutions have shown interest in cooperative accrediting ventures; others have been reluctant for various reasons. Some believe that cooperative efforts result in significant cost savings for institutions; others feel that the difficulties of coordination are nearly insurmountable. This study will gather opinions from a diverse, nationwide sample of postsecondary institutions. By so doing it will help COPA, which has responsibility for the governance of accreditation in the U.S., to determine the extent to which it should encourage interagency efforts among the accrediting groups. Your response is therefore important and we appreciate your willingness to help.

Your questionnaire booklet is coded, but only as a means of identifying institutions for follow-up purposes. We assure you that all responses will be anonymous. All returns will be pooled, individual institutions will lose their identity, and at no time will results be tied to institutions. Incidentally, the numbers to the right of the items are merely for the keypuncher and have no other significance.

Please take a few minutes now to give us your opinions, and return this to your president's (or chancellor's) office by May 10, 1979, where it will be packaged and mailed to:

COPA Survey
Educational Research and Services
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Thank You!

COPA-RECOGNIZED ACCREDITING AGENCIES

A. Regional and Institutional Accrediting Bodies

01 American Association of Bible Colleges
02 Association of Independent Colleges and Schools
03 Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
04 National Association of Trade and Technical Schools
05 National Home Study Council
06 New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
07 New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Vocational, Technical, Career Institutions
08 North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
09 Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges
10 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
11 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Occupational Education Institutions
12 Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities
13 Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

B. Specialized/Programmatic/Professional Accrediting Bodies

14 Accrediting Bureau of Health Professions Schools
15 Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Administration
16 AMA Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation
(in collaboration with various Allied Health Organizations)
17 American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business
18 American Bar Association/Association of American Law Schools
19 American Chemical Society
20 American Council for Construction Education
21 American Council on Education for Journalism
22 American Council on Pharmaceutical Education
23 American Dental Association
24 The American Dietetic Association
25 American Home Economics Association
26 American Library Association
27 American Optometric Association
28 American Osteopathic Association
29 American Physical Therapy Association
30 American Podiatry Association
31 American Psychological Association
32 American Society of Landscape Architects
33 American Speech, Language and Hearing Association
34 American Veterinary Medical Association
35 Association for Clinical Pastoral Education
36 Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada
37 The Council on Chiropractic Education
38 Council on Education for Public Health
39 Council on Rehabilitation Education
40 Council on Social Work Education
41 Engineers' Council for Professional Development
42 Foundation for Interior Design Education Research
43 Liaison Committee on Medical Education
44 National Architectural Accrediting Board
45 National Association for Industrial Technology
46 National Association for Practical Nurse Education and Service
47 National Association of Schools of Art
48 National Association of Schools of Music
49 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
50 National League for Nursing
51 Society of American Foresters
52 Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools

Opinions About Accreditation And Interagency Cooperative Arrangements

General Instructions: Most of the questions may be answered by simply placing an X in the appropriate space or drawing a circle around a coded response; other questions ask for written responses. However, you may write additional comments whenever you wish.

Parts II, III, and IV of this survey instrument ask your opinions about various aspects of accreditation. Please respond to the statements as they pertain to the institution, academic unit, or program area of which you are the head or representing. In other words, presidents, chief academic officers, or accreditation liaison officers should respond from a general institutional perspective; others should respond with their department, program area, school, or college as their frame of reference.

Part I
Background Experience

Please give information about yourself and your institution by checking or completing the following:

1. Your current position is:
   - 1 ☐ president
   - 2 ☐ chief academic official (title) _____
   - 3 ☐ accreditation liaison officer (8)
   - 4 ☐ head or representative of an academic unit/program

2. If you responded "4" to item 1, please list in the space below the code numbers of the specialized/programmatic/professional accrediting agencies serving your program or academic unit. (Section B of page 2 of this survey instrument presents a listing of all COPA-recognized specialized accrediting agencies, each with a two-digit code to the left of the agency's name.)

	(9-16)

3. I would classify my institution as (check one only):
   - 1 ☐ non-degree granting
   - 2 ☐ two-year college
   - 3 ☐ four-year liberal arts college
   - 4 ☐ single purpose/professional school (17)
   - 5 ☐ comprehensive with graduate or professional school(s)
   - 6 ☐ other (please specify)_____

4. My institution is:
   - 1 ☐ public
   - 2 ☐ private (18)
   - 3 ☐ proprietary (operated for profit)

5. Please indicate with an X the statement(s) that describe(s) your previous personal experience with accreditation.

   Member of an on-site visiting team:
   - ☐ specialized/professional/programmatic (19)
   - ☐ regional/institutional (20)

   Member of an accrediting commission:
   - ☐ specialized/professional/programmatic (21)
   - ☐ regional/institutional (22)

   Involved with conducting self-study or responding to accreditation report(s):
   - ☐ leadership role (i.e. chaired committee) (23)
   - ☐ member of committee (24)
   - ☐ limited involvement (25)

(26-27)

Part II
Your Opinions About Accreditation In General

Please respond to the following statements by placing a circle around the response of your choosing. The response code is:

A Strongly Agree

a Agree

? No opinion, undecided, do not know, do not understand statement

d Disagree

D Strongly Disagree

	1	2	3	4	5	
1. In most instances accreditation improves the overall quality of the institution and its programs.	A	a	?	d	D	(28)
2. Accreditation is too costly for what it accomplishes.	A	a	?	d	D	(29)
3. Specialized (or programmatic) accreditation is more important and helpful than institutional (or regional) accreditation.	A	a	?	d	D	(30)
4. Institutional (or regional) accreditation is more important and helpful than specialized (or programmatic) accreditation.	A	a	?	d	D	(31)
5. Both institutional (or regional) and specialized (or programmatic) accreditation are important and necessary.	A	a	?	d	D	(32)
6. Neither institutional (regional) nor specialized (programmatic) accreditation is important or necessary.	A	a	?	d	D	(33)
7. Specialized/programmatic accrediting agencies are too demanding.	A	a	?	d	D	(34)
8. Specialized/programmatic accrediting agencies are not rigorous enough in their evaluations.	A	a	?	d	D	(35)
9. Regional/institutional accrediting agencies are too demanding.	A	a	?	d	D	(36)
10. Regional/institutional accrediting agencies are not rigorous enough in their evaluations.	A	a	?	d	D	(37)

Part III
Your Opinions About Accreditation By More Than One Agency

Our sampling procedures assured us that this survey would be sent only to institutions being served by at least one regional/institutional and at least one specialized/programmatic accrediting agency. Parts III and IV of this questionnaire assume that your institution is thus involved with more than one agency. If for some reason this is not accurate, please fold the questionnaire and return it. Thank You.

If your institution participates in the activities of more than one accrediting agency, please give your opinions about the following statements by placing a circle around your response. The response code is:

A Strongly Agree

a Agree

? No opinion, undecided, do not know, do not understand statement

d Disagree

D Strongly Disagree

There is (are):	1	2	3	4	5	
1. duplication of efforts by the accrediting agencies ...	A	a	?	d	D	(39)
2. lack of coordination between the accrediting agencies in ...						
standards	A	a	?	d	D	(40)
terminology used	A	a	?	d	D	(41)
self-study	A	a	?	d	D	(42)
data requested	A	a	?	d	D	(43)
site visit activities	A	a	?	d	D	(44)
final report statement of facts and recommendations	A	a	?	d	D	(45)
accreditation decisions	A	a	?	d	D	(46)
3. burdens in terms of						
fees	A	a	?	d	D	(47)
preparation of reports	A	a	?	d	D	(48)
site visit expenses	A	a	?	d	D	(49)
time allocation for self-study report and site visit	A	a	?	d	D	(50)
contradictory demands made by separate accrediting agencies	A	a	?	d	D	(51)

4. In the space below, please list or describe any other concerns or problems caused by multiple accrediting agencies serving your institution.

Part IV

Your Opinion About Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements

There is a growing number of instances where two or more accrediting agencies work cooperatively with institutions. These cooperative ventures might be characterized by the following non-exhaustive listing of types of cooperative arangements.

Two or more accrediting agencies:

- visited the institution at the same time and used a common institutional self-study
- made separate visits but used the same self-study.
- visited at the same time, used same core data but required additional and separate program self-studies.
- visited at separate times, used same core data.

With the above as a frame of reference, please continue:

1. Which accrediting agencies **currently serving your institution, academic unit, or program area** are or could be grouped together for cooperative arrangements?

Please use the two-digit codes of the agencies (both A and B) listed on page 2 of this questionnaire

The following agencies could be grouped together for cooperative accreditation activities:

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

2. With respect to the overall accrediting activities at your institution, have any cooperative arrangements been experienced?
   1 ☐ yes (now go to item 6, page 7)
   2 ☐ no (answer items 3,4, and 5)
   3 ☐ do not know (answer 3,4, and 5) (52)

3. Although your institution has not experienced cooperative arrangements in accreditation, would your institution or academic unit be willing to participate in such activities?
   1 ☐ yes
   2 ☐ no
   3 ☐ do not know (53)

4. In your situation would a cooperative accrediting arrangement be ....

   a. more effective? 1 ☐ yes
   2 ☐ no
   3 ☐ do not know (54)

   b. more efficient? 1 ☐ yes
   2 ☐ no
   3 ☐ do not know (55)

5. Would your institution or academic program be willing to assume the lead in determining how accrediting agencies could cooperate in serving your institution?
   1 ☐ yes
   2 ☐ no
   3 ☐ do not know (56)

Please answer no more items. You are finished. Thank You! Please send this form to your president's office.

Respond to items 6-11 only if your institution/program has participated in a cooperative accrediting arrangement

6. Please indicate (by placing a circle around the response of your choice) your reaction to the following factors that may have been present in past cooperative accrediting arrangements at your institution.

YES Definitely!

yes

? Do not know

no

NO Definitely!

N/A Not applicable

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
a) The purposes of the cooperative arrangements were clear to each accrediting agency involved.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(57)
b) The purposes of the cooperative arrangements were clear to the institution/academic unit/program.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(58)
c) The agency assuming the coordinating responsibility was clearly identified.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(59)
d) Written agreements concerning the cooperative arrangements were negotiated among all parties involved prior to the visit.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(60)
e) The nature and composition of the self-study were clearly understood by all parties involved.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(61)
f) The coordinated self-study process was beneficial to our institution/academic unit/program.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(62)
g) The composition of the visiting team represented all agencies involved.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(63)
h) The size of the visiting team was appropriate for proper evaluation.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(64)
i) The team leader(s) were knowledgeable and interested in cooperative arrangements.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(65)
j) The written report reflected the purposes, standards, and scope of activities of all the agencies involved.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(66)
k) The fees and costs of the cooperative arrangements compared to separate studies/visits were less of a burden on the institution/academic unit/program.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(67)
l) Duplication of efforts was reduced by the cooperative arrangements.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(68)
m) The use of a generalist in specialized/programmatic accrediting resulted in a more balanced accrediting process.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(69)
n) The accreditation process was more helpful to the institution as a result of joint visits or other cooperative arrangements.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(70)
o) The resultant accreditation report(s) from the cooperative venture was (were) more beneficial to the institution than if separate visits/studies had been made.	YES	yes	?	no	NO	N/A	(71)

7. To what extent did top formal and informal leaders at your institution/academic unit/program support and actively participate in the cooperative arrangements?

1 ☐ Great extent
2 ☐ Moderate extent
3 ☐ Slight extent
4 ☐ Not at all
5 ☐ Do not know

(72)

8. What led to the cooperative accreditation arrangements that you experienced?

1 ☐ institution assumed the lead in requesting the cooperative activity.
2 ☐ The accrediting agencies made the suggestions which resulted in cooperation.
3 ☐ Other (please explain) _____

(73)

9. Based upon your experiences with past cooperative ventures, would your institution/academic unit/program participate in future cooperative arrangements?

1	2	3	4	5
YES	yes	?	no	NO

Please explain the reasons for your answer:

10. **Based on your experience,** do you have any recommendations as to how interagency cooperative arrangements could be improved in future situations?

11. If you have any additional comments related to your experience with interagency cooperative arrangements in accreditation, please record them below:

When finished, please send this survey form to your president's office. The president will return all copies sent to your institution in one package to: COPA Survey, Educational Research and Services, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403.

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

April 2, 1979

Dear Colleague:

There are now 53 nationally recognized accrediting agencies for postsecondary education and a number of others that have no recognition. By the nature of your institution, you probably are dealing with more than one, perhaps many, of these organizations. If that is the case, and if you have some feelings about how your institution should be relating to these groups, we would like to offer you an opportunity to let us know your interests and concerns.

One of the major ongoing responsibilities of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation is to assist institutions and accrediting agencies to work together in the interest of academic quality, and one of our continuing concerns is that accrediting activities be conducted as efficiently as possible. Some persons believe that increased cooperation and collaboration among accrediting agencies might help to contain costs, but we do not know to what extent institutions wish to pursue cooperative accrediting arrangements. In order to answer this and other questions related to accreditation, COPA will in the next few weeks survey all institutions of postsecondary education that are accredited by more than one agency. We need the assistance of your office in conducting this survey.

The survey form will be mailed to you on or about April 15, and we will be asking you, or someone designated by you, to complete one form on behalf of the general administration. We also will enclose additional copies of the opinionnaire, and we request that your office distribute these to other appropriate persons within your institution, to be filled out and returned to your office, and then mailed as a packet to COPA. (Instructions will be provided.)

We hope that we may have your cooperation in this important effort. The results of this survey will help COPA in determining the nature, strength, and diversity of institutional opinions about interagency cooperation in accreditation. This information in turn will enable us to focus our energies in ways most useful to the institutions.

We greatly appreciate your cooperation in this venture, which could be a significant one for the future of accreditation. We will be sharing our results with you, probably in the late summer or early fall.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth E. Young

Kenneth E. Young
President

Kenneth E. Young, President / Charles M. Chambers, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone: (202) 452-1433

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

April 16, 1979

Dear Colleague:

You should have recently received a letter from me indicating that you would be receiving the enclosed survey forms and explaining their purposes. (In case you did not receive my April 2nd letter, another copy is enclosed in this packet).

Also enclosed is a photocopy of a page from the COPA Directory, 1978-79 Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education. This page lists your institutional accrediting body and identifies your accredited programs.

We ask that you do the following:

1. Please personally complete, on behalf of your institution, one copy of the survey form (or have your chief academic official or your accredition liaison officer do it for you).

2. Please transmit a copy of the opinionnaire to the head of each of your accredited programs and request him/her to complete the form and mail it back to your office by May 15, 1979. The names of your accredited programs are listed on the enclosed photocopy of a page from the COPA Directory. For those institutions with engineering, please note that just the head of the engineering school or college is to complete a copy of the opinionnaire -- we have not sent enough forms for the chairpersons of the various engineering programs (such as chemical, civil, electrical, mechanical, etc.).

3. Please ask your secretary to keep a record of the forms sent out from your office and received in your office, and to remind the non-respondents. Also please ask your secretary to use the enclosed return envelope and place in the mail all the completed opinionnaires by May 21, 1979, and express our appreciation of her valuable assistance.

Please be assured that your responses, as well as others from your institution, will remain anonymous. Only summary tabulations and analyses will be presented to the various accrediting bodies and postsecondary institutions.

As before, we greatly appreciate your cooperation in this project.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth E. Young

Kenneth E. Young
President

Kenneth E. Young, President / Charles M. Chambers, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

The Council On Postsecondary Accreditation

May 25, 1979

Dear Colleague:

In April you received a letter from me, along with a packet of survey forms for distribution to others on your campus, so that your institution might participate in a survey to collect opinions about accreditation and interagency cooperation.

By now the opinionnaires may have been turned in to your office for forwarding in a packet to the research office for this project at Bowling Green State University. I would appreciate it if you could have someone check with the person responsible for returning the material to see if it has been mailed.

Response to date has been good, but we are eager to have as large a return as possible in order to get a correct picture of the amount and kind of accreditation at your institution and the attitudes of your key personnel about it. As I said in my letter of April 2, the results of this survey will help COPA in determining the nature, strength, and diversity of institutional opinions about interagency cooperation in accreditation. This information in turn will enable us to focus our energies in ways most useful to institutions.

Thank you for your follow-up attention to this matter. We have extended the May 10 deadline for returns to allow you to participate if you have not already done so.

Sincerely,

Kenneth E. Young

Kenneth E. Young
President

/pln

Kenneth E. Young, President / Charles M. Chambers, Staff Associate / James M. Phillips, Staff Associate

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 20036 phone: (202) 452-1433

Appendix 2

The Reasons for Respondents Wishing to Continue or Discontinue Future Cooperative Arrangements

Item IV-9 requested a yes-no answer to the following question and provided space for an explanation: "Based upon your experiences with past cooperative ventures, would your institution/academic unit/program participate in future cooperative arrangements?"

The written responses are summarized in relation to whether the respondents marked "yes" or "no" to item 9. (The numerals to the right of the statements indicate the number of respondents who wrote approximately the same statement.)

Comments from respondents who answered yes:

1. Less time consuming (41)
2. Less duplication of effort (41)
3. Less expensive (32)
4. Cooperation was good (15)
5. Easier and more efficient (12)
6. Worked out well (9)
7. Less disruption of campus schedule (6)
8. A good learning experience (5)
9. Yielded a more comprehensive review (4)
10. Institution is (was) given no choice (4)
11. Created more unity (3)
12. Willing to try again but hope for improvement (3)
13. Would advise more coordination (3)
14. Created an increased awareness (2)
15. Yes, but should be separate reports for each program (2)
16. Yes, but adequate time was not scheduled (2)

17. Yes, but need a common self-study report form (2)
18. Led to resources by way of workshops, seminars, and meetings that were helpful to the institution (2)
19. Coordinates goals toward a single direction—institution does not get caught between diverse philosophies developed in more than one report (2)

Comments from respondents who answered no:

1. Objectives should be more explicit (3)
2. Should be better coordinated (3)
3. Complications exceeded benefits (2)
4. Would be better to handle problems individually (2)
5. Favor two visits but use of same self-study (2)
6. Lack of cooperation (2)
7. Two agencies wrote two different reports on same visit (2)
8. Different philosophies put institution in the middle (2)
9. No, unless self-study, reports, and team members were accepted by all agencies and institution (2)

Appendix 3

A Listing of Concerns or Problems Caused by Multiple Accrediting Agencies Serving the Same Institution or Program

There were four items on the COPA Survey Form which provided space for the respondents to record written suggestions or comments. Approximately 25% of the respondents provided written comments for at least one of the four items-many of these people provided responses to more than one item. Approximately 75% of the respondents did not provide any written responses.

The first item which provided space for a written response was #4, page 5, and was embedded in Part III of the survey. Part III of the survey was titled: Your Opinions About Accreditation By More Than One Agency.

Item #4 read: "In the space below, please list or describe any other concerns or problems caused by multiple accrediting agencies serving your institution."

Many respondents restated some of the problems described by other items in Part III. Nevertheless, and for the purposes of this summary, all written comments where two or more respondents gave similar comments were recognized. In general, single or unique comments were disregarded for summary tabulations. (The numerals to the right of the statements indicate the number of respondents who wrote approximately the same statement.)

Concerns or Problems Caused by Multiple Accrediting Agencies

1. Involves too much time (45)
2. Too many visits (40)
3. Too much duplication (34)
4. Costs too much (31)
5. Too many reports (29)
6. No coordination among and between agencies (25)
7. Too many self-studies (19)
8. Accreditation time periods differ (18)
9. Agencies were inconsistent (16)
10. Standards not clear (15)
11. Inflexible standards (10)
12. Quality of team members differed to significant degree (10)
13. Formats too rigid (9)
14. Agencies had different goals (8)
15. State accrediting agencies (and other non-COPA agencies) should be involved (8)
16. Same program rated differently by different people (agencies) (7)
17. Too subjective (7)
18. Unrealistic requirements (7)
19. Too many bosses (6)
20. General lack of understanding (6)
21. Tensions created in group and at institution (6)
22. Poor communication (5)
23. Conflicts between agencies (5)

24. Lack of cooperation (5)
25. Agencies did not focus upon student learning (5)
26. Very inefficient (4)
27. Poor preparation by members of visiting teams (4)
28. Should look at institution, not specific programs (4)
29. Appeal process is poor (4)
30. Agencies are reluctant to trust each other's findings (3)
31. Should look at programs, not institutions (3)
32. Guidelines often prepared for ideal situation, not the everyday realities of higher education (3)
33. Agencies make demands that conflict with university policy or with state/federal regulations (3)
34. Visitors were biased (3)
35. Size of team and poor selection of team members (2)
36. Compliance with one agency sometimes create problems with another agency (2)
37. Why must one agency request median, another the mean, one agency rank by quartiles, another by deciles, etc.? (2)
38. Can't we standardize how we count courses? (2)
39. No two agencies look at scholarship funds the same way. (2)

One individual's statement tends to summarize many of the problems listed above: "Much data sought by two or more accrediting agencies is highly duplicative--but not to the degree that the same data can be submitted twice. Each agency seeks data cast in varying or unique formats, interpretations, etc., all of which means that all data must be constantly recast because of subtle differences in the way the questions are phrased."

Some respondents made positive statements regarding multiple accreditation:

1. No problem (32)
2. No problem because of different goals and objectives (14)
3. Expenses and time spent are necessary (12)
4. Teams work well together (5)
5. And one person stated: "If we must have accreditation, we should not force uniformity-conflict, overlap, and confusion is a small price to pay to avoid oppressive sterility."

Appendix 4

Suggested Groupings of Agencies for Cooperative Accreditation Activities

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS' SUGGESTIONS REGARDING THE GROUPING OF AGENCIES FOR COOPERATIVE ACCREDITATION ACTIVITIES

The first section of Part IV of the survey instrument is reproduced below:

Part IV

Your Opinion About Cooperative Accrediting Arrangements

There is a growing number of instances where two or more accrediting agencies work cooperatively with institutions. These cooperative ventures might be characterized by the following non-exhaustive listing of types of cooperative arangements.

Two or more accrediting agencies:

- visited the institution at the same time and used a common institutional self-study
- made separate visits but used the same self-study.
- visited at the same time, used same core data but required additional and separate program self-studies.
- visited at separate times, used same core data.

With the above as a frame of reference, please continue:

1. Which accrediting agencies **currently serving your institution, academic unit, or program area** are or could be grouped together for cooperative arrangements?

Please use the two-digit codes of the agencies (both A and B) listed on page 2 of this questionnaire

The following agencies could be grouped together for cooperative accreditation activities:

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

The reader of this report may turn to Appendix 1 wherein a copy of the survey instrument is presented. On page 2 of the survey is a listing of the 52 regional and specialized accrediting agencies. (Due to a printing error the Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools was listed in the survey as the "Accrediting Bureau of Health Professions

Schools." This caused some confusion and was corrected by a separate mailing to all institutions.)

An arbitrary decision was made to list only those groupings that had been suggested by three or more respondents. In parentheses to the right of each grouping is an indication of the number of respondents who suggested such a grouping of accrediting agencies.

Most of the suggestions paired a regional agency with one or more specialized agencies. However, some respondents also suggested cooperative accreditation by two or more specialized agencies. Again, suggestions were not tabulated unless three or more respondents agreed to the same groupings. (Please refer to page 55 for the numbered list of accrediting agencies.)

The Suggestions

1. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 01 (American Association of Bible Colleges)

   No suggestions met the criterion of at least three similar responses.

2. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 02 (Association of Independent Colleges and Schools)

   02, 16, and 23 (3)
   02, 10, 48, and 49 (3)

3. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 03 (Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools)

   03 and 50 (27)
   03 and 49 (27)
   03 and 41 (16)
   03 and 23 (11)
   03 and 40 (7)
   03 and 36 (4)
   03 and 29 (4)
   03 and 48 (4)
   03 and 22 (3)
   03 and 19 (3)
   03 and 17 (3)
   03 and 16 (3)
   03 and 52 (3)

   03, 16 and 50 (7)

4. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 04 (National Association of Trade and Technical Schools)

   No suggestions met the criterion of at least three similar responses.

5. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 05 (National Home Study Council

No suggestions met the criterion of at least three similar responses.

6. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 06 (New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Institutions of Higher Education)

06 and 50 (6)
06 and 41 (3)
06, 23 and 50 (3)

7. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 07 (New England Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Vocational, Technical, Career Institutions)

No suggestions met the criterion of at least three similar responses.

8. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 08 (North Central Association of Colleges and Schools)

08 and 49 (47)
08 and 50 (18)
08 and 41 (14)
08 and 48 (12)
08 and 16 (10)
08 and 23 (9)
08 and 17 (7)
08 and 36 (6)
08 and 33 (4)
08 and 19 (4)
08 and 52 (3)
08 and 22 (3)

08, 48, and 49 (7)
08, 49, and 50 (5)
08, 19, and 41 (3)
08, 23, and 50 (3)
08, 33, and 49 (3)
08, 47, and 48 (3)

08, 48, 49, and 50 (5)

9. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 09 (Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges)

09 and 50 (4)
09 and 49 (4)
09 and 17 (3)
09 and 23 (3)
09 and 41 (3)
09 and 48 (3)
09, 16, and 29 (3)
09, 48, and 49 (3)

10. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 10 (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges)

10 and 49 (27)	10 and 43 (8)
10 and 50 (22)	10 and 48 (7)
10 and 23 (10)	10 and 19 (6)
10 and 16 (9)	10 and 29 (5)
10 and 41 (9)	10 and 17 (4)
10 and 40 (8)	10 and 26 (3)

10, 48, and 49 (7)
10, 16, and 23 (6)
10, 23, and 50 (4)
10, 19, and 50 (3)
10, 26, and 49 (3)

10, 48, 49, and 50 (3)

11. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 11 (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Occupational Education Institutions)

No suggestions met the criterion of at least three similar responses.

12. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 12 (Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities)

12 and 41 (9)	12 and 49 (3)
12 and 48 (5)	12 and 29 (3)
12 and 50 (4)	12 and 36 (3)
12 and 19 (4)	12 and 17 (3)

12, 25, and 49 (3)

13. Grouped with Regional/Institutional 13 (Western Association of Schools and College Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges)

13 and 23 (6)
13 and 50 (4)
13 and 16 (3)

13, 16, and 23 (3)

Some of the respondents suggested the following groups of specialized accrediting agencies-with no mention of regional or institutional bodies.

48 and 49 (23)
24 and 25 (22)
16 and 50 (20)
16 and 29 (15)
23 and 50 (13)
29 and 50 (9)
16 and 23 (9)

24 and 42 (8)
46 and 50 (7)
47 and 48 (6)
33 and 49 (4)
41 and 45 (4)
42 and 47 (3)

16, 23, and 50 (10)
14, 15, and 16 (8)
14, 15, and 50 (7)
24, 25, and 42 (4)
24, 25, and 49 (3)

Appendix 5

Recommendations as to How Interagency Cooperative Arrangements Could Be Improved

Question 10 was stated as follows: "Based on your experience, do you have any recommendations as to how interagency cooperative arrangements could be improved in future situations?"

A tabulation of the respondents' written comments were as fbllows:

1. We must know standards in advance (14)
2. Should be more cooperation (12)
3. One agency report instead of two or more (12)
4. Need advance planning (8)
5. One agency visiting at a time using self-study prepared for multiple agencies (7)
6. Increase communication (6)
7. Should establish jurisdiction of each agency (6)
8. Smaller visiting teams (5)
9. Accreditation periods should be the same (4)
10. Better coordination of campus visits (3)
11. Team members should meet before, during, and after visitation (2)
12. Much coordination between chairs of the two groups (2)
13. There should be just one chairperson of the visiting team (2)
14. Specialized should work closely with regionals (2)
15. Use of a common self-study (2)
16. Publish a "Primer on Cooperative Self-Study and On-Site Visits" (2)
17. Involve state agencies (2)

Appendix 6

Additional Comments Related to Respondents' Experiences With Interagency Cooperative Arrangements in Accreditation

Item IV-11 read as follows: "If you have any additional comments related to your experience with interagency cooperative arrangements in accreditation, please record them below:"

A tabulation of the responses follows:

1. One visit better than two (6)
2. Reports should be coordinated (5)
3. Reduce bias and self-interest (3)
4. Standardize self-studies (3)
5. Cooperation reduces effort and expenses (3)
6. Need more advance planning (3)
7. It will be easier the next time! (2)
8. Agencies should arrange joint visits--not institutions (2)
9. One agency should accept decision of another agency (2)
10. Make sure team members are competent (2)
11. Length of visits should be same (2)
12. Peer evaluation is the best system (2)
13. All visitors should stay in same motel to improve communication and transportation (2)
14. Have someone on team who could have an overview—probably a president (2)

And one respondent wrote: "In an age of accountability and limited resource availability, a decrease in cost and a more effective and efficient approach to accreditation seems in order. Accreditation serves such a vital purpose to the college and the specialized programs that it cannot be abandoned but it must also be practical in a time and monetary sense."